

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/626,009	07/24/2003	Ashoke K. SenGupta	28216/38681B	9906	
4743	7590 01/30/2006	EXAMINER			
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP 233 S. WACKER DRIVE, SUITE 6300 SEARS TOWER			CHEUNG, WILLIAM K		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO,	L 60606		1713		

DATE MAILED: 01/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/626,009	SENGUPTA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	William K. Cheung	1713	

			•				
	William K. Cheung	1713					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 19 January 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS		•					
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or of this application, applicant must timely file one of the followances the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notation (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in complete following time periods: 	n the same day as filing a Notice o wing replies: (1) an amendment, a ptice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	f Appeal. To avoid at fidavit, or other evide compliance with 37 (ence, which CFR 41.31; or				
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of	the final rejection.						
event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later that	b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension a CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened standard, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months	nd the corresponding amount of the fee. atutory period for reply originally set in the	The appropriate extension final Office action; or (2)	on fee under 37 as set forth in (b)				
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1,704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL		,,	, ;				
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in composition of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any e Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be	xtension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e))), to avoid dismissal o	of the appeal.				
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo	w);	·					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or	ter form for appeal by materially re	educing or simplifying	the issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	. (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	_					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		ill be entered and an	explanation of				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-10,12-18 and 34-37</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <i>none</i> .							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	entry is below or attac	hed.				
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12 Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No/s)							
13. Other:							
WILLIAM K. CHANNER							
13. Other: WILLIAM K. CHEUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER							
	•	1/24/	2006				

Continuation Sheet (PTOL-303)

Application No.

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Since the preceding claims of proposed new claim 38 are not in condition for allowance, the proposed new claim 38 would require further consideration and/or search by the examiner.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants argue that '218 fail to teach an amphiphathic copolymer as claimed. However, applicants fail to recognize that the deficiency of '218 had been met by the teachings of '945. Regarding applicants' argument that the claimed invention does not involve a cationic surfactant, applicants fail to recognize that the claims as written do not exclude a cationic surfactant. Regarding the argued "unexpected" results presented in the affidavit of January 19. 1006, the results do not overcome the rejection set forth because the copolymers cited as "unexpected" results are not block copolymers as required by the prior art '945.

1/24/2006

WILLIAM K. CHEUNG PRIMARY EXAMINER